



Education Data Division - Request for Change Form for CBDS

Section 1 - Details of Change

(To be completed by the RFC Originator / CBDS Administrator)

Project / Service: CBDS	Type of Change: New Data Items	RFC 765
Name and team/company of RFC Originator: Phil Dent DDU EDD		
Originator Contact No: 01325 735409	Originator email address: phil.dent@education.gsi.gov.uk	
Date RFC Raised: 09 December 2014	Date change required: For inclusion in the 2014/15 Summer School	
Priority: 1	1 = Top - Ministerial or legislative requirement 2 = High - Senior official customer requirement or clear net benefit / efficiency saving to EDD, department or MIS suppliers 3 = Medium - Customer requirement, marginal net benefit 4 = Low - Nice to have, net cost, does not affect functionality, cosmetic change	
EDD Contact: Queries.SUPPLIER@education.gsi.gov.uk		
Change Title: Type of Childcare		

Data item / Rule Number:

The creation of 2 new data items for type of childcare and signposting off-site childcare.

1. Type of Childcare

Metadata Requirements:

Sequential Number – TBA

CBDS Level – School

CBDS Module – Miscellaneous module

Identifier 1 – TBA

Identifier 2 – n/a

Data Item Name – Type of Childcare

Description – Records the type of childcare for which the remaining data within the container refers

Type and format – A(1)

Code set / Valid values – [B] – Before School Childcare, [A] – After School Childcare, [H] – Holiday Childcare, [U] – Under Fives Childcare

Item level validation – None

XML Tag - <TypeOfChildcare>

Status – Active

History Notes – C

Multiplicity Notes – M (Multiple current occurrence)

2. Signposting off-site childcare provision

Metadata Requirements:

Sequential Number – TBA

CBDS Level – School

CBDS Module – Miscellaneous module

Identifier 1 – TBA

Identifier 2 – n/a

Data Item Name – Signposting off-site childcare provision

Description – Records whether the school promotes or signposts off-site childcare

Type and format – A(1)

Code set / Valid values – [Y] – Yes, [N] - No

Item level validation – None

XML Tag - <ChildcareSignposting>

Status – Active

History Notes – C

Multiplicity Notes – S (Single current occurrence)

Description of change:

RFC 743 introduced new data items to allow the collection of data on the provision of childcare within schools. The data items introduced within this RFC simplify the data structure introduced in RFC 743 following feedback from suppliers and enable the capture of the answer where “no” is given for <OnSite>.

Reason for change (including benefits):

The data collected will help to evaluate the impact of policies on the number of schools offering childcare and track progress against our aim to increase the numbers. It will also help formulate new policies that are currently being pushed by Ministers. However the data will **not** be published in any format where an individual school and/or LA is identifiable.

The addition of <TypeOfChildcare> will simplify the XML structure within the Miscellaneous Module – as advised by Suppliers with the addition of <ChildcareSignposting> enabling capture of the “no” answer.

Impact of not doing the change:

This policy area is a Ministerial priority (and is likely to remain as one irrespective of the election result in 2015 given that the opposition has already announced an outline policy) and without these changes, the Department will hold no data to either inform policy development decisions or evaluate the impact of existing policies on increasing availability of childcare. The availability, affordability and flexibility of childcare is a very hot topic at the moment, and will remain so beyond the Election.

ISB view of the proposed change:**Funding availability:**

Not applicable

Impact assessment to be undertaken by:

Core software suppliers

Working Group

ISB

Date consulted:

09/12/2014

Response requested by:

18/12/2014

Section 2 - Impact Analysis

(To be completed by Impact Assessors)

Software Suppliers' Summary of Impact Assessment:

Supplier 1

We welcome these two new questions as this will make it easier to structure the inclusion of the other questions.

Software Suppliers' Summary of Impact Assessment continued:

Supplier 2

Re: 'Type of Childcare' -

- No major issues.
- Is it worth considering removing the word 'Childcare' from the descriptions in the codeset for brevity? i.e. if the field is likely to appear as 'Type of Childcare', then the descriptions would only need to be 'Before School', 'After School' etc...
- Is the description "Under Fives Childcare' missing an apostrophe? (Note that an alternative to including an apostrophe might be to remove the s so we get "Under Five Childcare" or similar.

Re: Signposting off-site childcare provision

- If Signposting and On-Site have only two possible answers, should they be standard 'Boolean' type fields (with True, False, 0, 1) options
- If I have understood the flowchart in RFC 766 & intent of this field correctly, the only valid/invalid combinations of answers for On Site and Signposting are as follows, but please see the associated comments.

<OnSite>	<ChildcareSignposting>	Valid?	Comment
N	N	Yes	
N	Y	Yes	
Y	N	No?	Not clear if this tag is always expected. Should Signposting always be absent if OnSite is Y? Or should it always be 'N' when <OnSite> is Y
Y	Y	No	Is there ever a case where a school could both provide onsite care AND signpost Offsite care – the flowchart suggests that this can't happen, but this is not clear.

- If (as suggested by the above table) Signposting can never be Y when <OnSite> is Y, then would it be worth merging these to a single field along the following lines:
- <NatureOfProvision> with options "On-Site", "Off-Site", "None"
- This would then reduce the number of fields and also help with data validity by limiting users to choices that are valid (i.e. they could choose the possibly invalid Y/Y combination)

DfE Internal Colleagues' Summary of Impact Assessment:

TDU: This ties in with RFC 766. While RFC 766 is the work required to add the additional columns to Summer 2015 Census, this RFC (765) is for the creation of the new items on the CBDS database and as such it will have negligible impact for TDU.

Helpdesk: I have read RFC 765. There shouldn't be any significant impact on the helpdesk.

Alternative Solutions / Workarounds (if appropriate):**Estimated Cost of Change:****Impact Assessed by (name):****Date:****Section 3 - Outcome / Decision****(To be completed CBDS administrator)****Review Meeting:** CBDS administrator review**Attendees:** Kirsty Bennett, Amanda Robinson, Phil Dent, Gary Connell, Jenny Simpson, Iain King, Louise Shutt**Date of Review Meeting:**

12/01/15

Brief Summary of Discussion:

For Supplier 2 feedback we agreed that we can remove the word 'childcare' from the descriptions in the codeset.

The board discussed all comments and agreed to go ahead with these new data items.

Accept / Reject:

Accept

Deferred to:

n/a

Type of Funding:

n/a

Fund Holder Agreement:

n/a

If Defer, provide details

If Accept, provide details:

New CBDS data items 200662 Type of Childcare, 200663 Signposting off-site childcare provision have been set up with entry date of 13/01/15

If Reject, provide details:

© Crown copyright 2014